

Meeting with Exxon to discuss FI Report
04/21/2009

PRP's representing Exxon and Helena Chemical, and Dave Backus w/ Ensafe. We made introductions and then went over the ADEQ comments of the FI Report.

- Section 4 of the Report indicates historical data comparisons were made on the alluvial aquifer presented in Table 11. Were any historical data comparisons made on the perched aquifer?
 - Mark responded that there may not be accurate historical data to make a reasonable comparison, i.e. it would not be an apples to apples comparison. They will go back and look for any data that can be used to make a decent comparison
- Where is the historical data listed in Table 11 referenced from?
 - This information is available and will be addressed.
- Appendix F; Wells number 1 and 2 appear to be improperly located on the well location map. Well number 2 appears to be on Cedar property and well number 1 is located north of the Norac property.
 - They will look over and determine where wells are marked. Sometimes the size of a map can distort the location of a well.
 - Ryan : "the one on cedar may be important"
- Figure 2 – Suspected Source Areas does not include the former surface water ponds and the current waste water treatment ponds, which were mentioned in the report.
 - Mark will look back and verify what was stated in the report is what the figure meant to depict. Mark said the intent of the figure might have been to focus on source areas in the process area.
- Page 20, 3rd Paragraph – This paragraph states 4-chloroaniline was detected within the drum vault at concentrations ranging from 4.0 to 11.0 mg/kg. Table 6 indicates 4-chloroaniline was detected from 5.0 to 11.0 mg/kg. Please correct either the narrative or Table 6.
 - Minor issue, will be corrected

They are to submit a revised FI Report addressing the above comments w/in 30 days of receipt of letter. I think the Feasibility Study will be submitted 60 days after approval of the FI Report. Other topics discussed were:

Harcross: They have withdrawn their air permit, which means they will not process what they originally intended b/c there is no market for it. They will likely not go forward with purchasing the site. Ryan said it is likely that the units will be scrapped for the state to recover cost. The library, lab, warehouse, ect. would remain.

Drum Vault: Allen believed that we should start talking about this now so we're on the same page when they submit the Feasibility Study. Ryan's view was that this topic is

independent of the FS. The main conflict was: if we don't have to excavate, lets let adeq tell us what to do. ryans view was - you guys submit a fs, and don't let us do the consulting for you.

Monthly Reporting: this has now changed to quarterly reporting since there is not as much activity.